



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,350	05/25/2001	Martin Cullen	P-3925-1	2355

7590

05/29/2002

MYRON AMER, P.C.  
114 Old Country Road  
Suite 310  
Mineola, NY 11501

EXAMINER

RACHUBA, MAURINA T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3723

DATE MAILED: 05/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/864,350

Applicant(s)

CULLEN, MARTIN

Examiner

M Rachuba

Art Unit

3723

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 May 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.  
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

M Rachuba  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 3723

Art Unit: 3723

MPEP 2114 states in part :

**MANNER OF OPERATING THE DEVICE DOES NOT DIFFERENTIATE**

**APPARATUS CLAIM FROM THE PRIOR ART**

A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987) (The preamble of claim 1 recited that the apparatus was "for mixing flowing developer material" and the body of the claim recited "means for mixing..., said mixing means being stationary and completely submerged in the developer material". The claim was rejected over a reference which taught all the structural limitations of the claim for the intended use of mixing flowing developer. However, the mixer was only partially submerged in the developer material. The Board held that the amount of submersion is immaterial to the structure of the mixer and thus the claim was properly rejected.)

MPEP 2115 further states in part:

**MATERIAL OR ARTICLE WORKED UPON DOES NOT LIMIT APPARATUS CLAIMS**

"Expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim." Ex parte Thibault, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969). Furthermore, "[i]nclusion of material or article worked upon by a structure being claimed does not impart patentability to the claims." In re Young, 75 F.2d 966, 25 USPQ 69 (CCPA 1935) (as restated in In re Otto, 312 F.2d 937, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963)).

In *In re Young*, a claim to a machine for making concrete beams included a limitation to the concrete reinforced members made by the machine as well as the structural elements of the machine itself. The court held that the inclusion of the article formed within the body of the claim did not, without more, make the claim patentable.

In *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967), an apparatus claim recited “[a] taping machine comprising a supporting structure, a brush attached to said supporting structure, said brush being formed with projecting bristles which terminate in free ends to collectively define a surface to which adhesive tape will detachably adhere, and means for providing relative motion between said brush and said supporting structure while said adhesive tape is adhered to said surface.” An obviousness rejection was made over a reference to Kienzle which taught a machine for perforating sheets. The court upheld the rejection stating that “the references in claim 1 to adhesive tape handling do not expressly or impliedly require any particular structure in addition to that of Kienzle.” The perforating device had the structure of the taping device as claimed, the difference was in the use of the device, and “the manner or method in which such machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself.”

### ***RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT***

1. Applicant argues that *In re Casey* does not support the examiner's reliance on the dicta that “method steps...cannot...confer patentability on an apparatus claim” and that the examiner cannot dismiss out of hand applicant's claim phrased substantively different than the claim of *In re Casey*. The examiner disagrees. *In re Casey*, while the

Art Unit: 3723

phrase "taping machine" appears in the preamble and the body of the claim, it is clearly an intended use of the machine. While applicant's method steps are in the body of the claim, and contain more information than the phrase "taping machine", they are still directed to the intended use of the machine. Both MPEP sections 2114 and 2115, direct that the manner in which an apparatus is used cannot define over a reference which teaches the exact same structure-that there must be a structural difference between the claimed invention, and the prior art. Applicant has not claimed any structure different than that of Sigetich et al. That applicant may use the exact same structure differently is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself. Note also Ex parte Masham as set forth above.

Applicant should note that the examiner did not "dismiss out of hand" any of applicant's claimed limitations. The examiner is required to consider all limitations, and to treat them on their merits. This has been done, and the examiner has treated the method limitations as set forth in papers 3, 5 and 7.

It is the examiner's position that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has been made.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning the content of this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Rachuba whose telephone number is (703) 308-1361. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, and alternate Fridays from 8:30 AM to 4:00 PM. Any inquiries concerning other than the content of this and previous communications, such as missing references

Art Unit: 3723

or filed papers not acknowledged, should be directed to the Customer Service

Representative, Tech Center 3700, (703) 306-5648.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail, can be reached on (703) 308-2687. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9302.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9302.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

M. RACHUBA  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3723



mtr  
May 29, 2002